original intent of the 1977 statute: To place with the primacy States the exclusive jurisdiction to regulate surface coal mining operations within their borders. The bill will clarify the respective roles of the Federal and State governments, avoid costly and inefficient duplication in inspection and enforcement and establish clearer lines as to the activities subject to the law.

When the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act [SMCRA] was enacted in 1977, it was hailed as a model of cooperative federalism. It established a set of pervasive environmental and reclamation performance standards for all surface and underground mines in the United States. It also included provisions to allow each coal producing State which was able to demonstrate that it had adequate laws and organizations in place to assume primary responsibility for regulating coal mining operations with its State. Since that time, 23 of the 26 coal producing States have assumed the role as the SMCRA regulatory authority.

Unfortunately, The Office of Surface Mining [OSM] has proven reluctant to live up to this statutory promise and hand over fully the reins of regulation to these primacy States. Instead, OSM has perpetuated a dual regulatory scheme by its policies that entail daily interference through the issuance of notice of violations [NOV's] directly to coal mine operators in primacy States. The original act was clear that OSM's oversight role did not allow such pervasive intervention. OSM is only authorized to issue a cessation order for serious violations constituting an imminent harm or danger to the public or environment. Otherwise, OSM was to evaluate State performance, and if dissatisfied, initiate proceedings to substitute either Federal enforcement or a Federal program for all or part of the State program.

OSM's policies have ignored the careful balance of authority by intervening every day in State program matters by issuing notice of violations directly to operators anytime OSM disagrees with a State's view of program requirements. This practice has victimized coal mine operators caught in the middle of Federal-State disputes; perpetuated a scheme of dual and conflicting program administration; caused regulatory uncertainty and confusion, and bred disrespect for the States and the law itself.

As one Federal court observed, OSM's practice has upset SMCRA's fragile balance ''between the federal and state roles with its trampling of the state's right to enforce its laws.'' *Fincastle Mining Inc.* v. *Babbitt,* 842 F.Supp. 204, 209 (W.D. Va. 1993).

A poignant example of this problem occurred in 1993 when OSM challenged one of Wyoming's existing permit conditions at the Black Thunder Mine as it related to its rough backfilling and grading plan. OSM wanted to issue an order requiring Black Thunder to mine and reclaim in a manner that practically speaking could not be achieved and which was actually based on an outdated rule.

After the mine submitted a modified mining and reclamation plan to the State agency, the State requested that it delay its backfilling and grading until it had an opportunity to review the plan revisions. In the meantime, OSM issued a 10-day notice to the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality in an effort to pressure the State into bringing enforcement action against the mine. The State rigorously opposed OSM's efforts. Yet only after extensive time and resources were expended on the issue did OSM finally agree that the issue was programmatic rather than regulatory and dropped its threat.

The amendments act will clarify that OSM does not have the authority to issue notice of violations in primacy States unless and until it has followed the procedures set forth in the 1977 law to substitute Federal enforcement for the State program.

The act's legislative history confirms the original intent that notice-of-violation authority belonged only to the regulatory authority and operators need to know who that regulatory authority is at any particular time—OSM or the States. My legislation will further restore meaning to the concept of State primary by codifying the well-established principle that the approved State program is the law applicable in that State. Permits issued pursuant to those State programs would be the benchmark for compliance until modified in accordance with the permit revisions procedures of the State program.

This legislation is also intended to avoid regulatory duplication among various programs, require greater efficiency in enforcement actions and streamline the administrative appeal process for agency actions.

Since the passage of SMCRA, the number of producing mines has declined by more than 50 percent and the States have assumed the primary role for implementing SMCRA for 97 percent of the Nation's mines and production. However, the agency overseeing the States, OSM, has not changed significantly in terms of its size or duplicative role. The agency still has substantially more personnel than it had 12 years ago when the States assumed primacy.

As a result, the agency has sought to expand its reach to other activities such as regulating public roads, attempting to assume the role of separate agencies vested with authority to administer the Clean Water Act and raising stale matters as possible violations of SMCRA.

My amendments to the act will clarify that: public roads are not subject to regulation; the authority to administer the Clean Water Act at coal mines belongs to the regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act and not SMCRA; and, place a 3-year time limitation upon commencing actions for alleged violations. Finally, the legislation would remove an extra and inefficient layer of administrative review of agency decisions before seeking review in court. The extra layer of administrative appeals is a creature of OSM's regulations and not mandated by the existing statute.

In summation, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Amendments Act of 1995 would reinforce the federalist scheme of the original law and restore true meaning to the concept of State primacy.

## THE KEY TO JOBS

### HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 21, 1995*

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting this morning with the congressional travel and tourism caucus.

I'm reporting that the travel and tourism is hard at work in every district in the Nation: from restaurants to retailers, hotels to campgrounds, airlines to rental cars.

With 13 million employees nationwide and an economic impact of $416 billion, each and every one of you here needs to stand up and take notice.

Now, I know we're all very busy, but listen to these facts: Tourism is No. 1 in service exports; tourism generates exports equal to exporting 4-million cars, 1.15-million blue jeans or 5.5-billion bushels of wheat.

Tourism generates $54 billion in Federal, State and local taxes.

If this had to be replaced, the average American household would have to pay an additional $652 in income tax every year.

But note well for three straight years, U.S. market share of international travelers has deteriorated. And it's going to fall again this year.

Clearly, we must take action. I offer you three solutions:

First, On October 30 to 31, join the 1,700 travel industry professionals for the first ever White House Conference.

Second, join the tourism caucus—support your district. We already have more than 273 members.

Third, cosponsor H.R. 1083—The Travel and Tourism Relief Act. It's economically vital to your district and it's vital to America.

## MILITARY EXCESS AND THE PROGRESSIVE ALTERNATIVE

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 21, 1995*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed this body often to discuss America's exorbitant defense spending. As the former chairman of the Government Operations Committee and its subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, I am intimately familiar with fraud, waste and financial self-indulgence in the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex at large. The fact that every one of the top 10 military contractors has either been convicted of or admitted to procurement fraud since 1980 as the Campaign for New Priorities recently pointed out, reminds all of us just how deep and pervasive their breach of trust with the American taxpayer has been.

Besides abuse and mismanagement in the private sector though, neglect by the Government remains equally of concern. We have funded meaningless, unnecessary military programs year after year.

Today I rise to bring to your attention the work of my distinguished colleague from California, RON DELLUMS, the ranking member of the House National Security Committee, who has articulated an alternative to this madness. In the October 2 issue of the The Nation, he outlines a post cold war paradigm—at post cold war funding levels. I think this article, which I am entering into the RECORD, demonstrates my colleague's years of reflection and expertise on these issues. I commend him for his scholarship and I hope you will grant it the careful study it deserves.

STEALTH BOMBING, AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Ronald Dellums)

The September 7 House of Representatives vote to approve funding for the B-2 bomber—money the Pentagon does not even want—thrust forward the crucial question of the nation's military budget. After World War II,